

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
4 AT SEATTLE

5 RICCARDO GREEN,
6
7 v.
8
9 SEATTLE ART MUSEUM,

10 Plaintiff(s),

11 Defendant(s).

12 NO. C07-58MJP

13 ORDER ON MOTION FOR
14 RECONSIDERATION

15 The above-entitled Court, having received and reviewed:

- 16 1. Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration Local Rule 7(h) (Dkt. No. 52)
17 2. Plaintiff's Surreply to Defendant's Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Serve
18 Additional Interrogatories (Dkt. No. 51)

19 and all exhibits and declarations attached thereto, makes the following ruling:

20 IT IS ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

21 Plaintiff alleges error in the Court's failure to consider his "Surreply to Defendant's Opposition
22 to Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Serve Additional Interrogatories," a document which was filed on
23 October 10, 2007, five days after the noting date for Plaintiff's motion, and not received by the Court
24 until after the order denying Plaintiff's motion had been filed.

25 Local Rule 7(h) delineates very specifically the issues which may be addressed in a motion to
26 reconsider: ""matters which the movant believes were overlooked or misapprehended by the court,
[and] any new matters being brought to the court's attention for the first time." Since Plaintiff's
original motion (the only document filed prior to the noting date) contained neither the nature of the
additional interrogatories nor the grounds for requesting them, there was nothing which could be
overlooked or misapprehended.

1 Nor does the motion contain "any new matters being brought to the court's attention for the
2 first time;" in other words, matters which could not have been raised in the original motion because
3 they had only been discovered since the motion was filed. Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration merely
4 introduces evidence and arguments that Plaintiff failed to bring in his original motion, evidence which
5 he could have introduced but did not. As has been pointed out in earlier orders, Plaintiff has litigated a
6 multitude of cases in this district and will be expected to adhere to the levels of knowledge,
7 competence and professionalism that would be required of any other practitioner.

8 Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration is denied, and he will not be permitted to file any
9 interrogatories above and beyond that permitted by the rules of discovery.

10

11 The clerk is directed to provide copies of this order to all counsel of record.

12

Dated: October 23, 2007

13

14



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Marsha J. Pechman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the last name.

15 Marsha J. Pechman
U.S. District Judge

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26